Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/839,762	LUCARELLI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nathan M. Nutter	1711
All Participants: Status of Application: After Decision of Board of Appeals		
(1) <u>Nathan M. Nutter</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Michelle Lando</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 July 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Proposed rejection of claims 1-23 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting		
Claims discussed: 1-23		
Prior art documents discussed: Lucarelli et al (U.S.P.N. 6,228,927)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
4/ // //		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Application No. 09/839,762

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' counsel was contacted to discuss the proposed rejection of claims 1-23 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over the claims of Lucarelli et al (U.S.P.N. 6,228,927), newly cited. Counsel proposes to submit a Terminal Disclaimer over the claims of this patent to prevent the re-opening of prosecution since that appears to be the only issue remaining concerning the patentability of the instant claims.